

No obvious environmental factor or combination of factors explains the distribution of one- and two-leaved forms. As the map indicates, however, the two-leaved form has the more southern distribution, with all but three of the known populations occurring south of latitude 37°30'N. Except for the mixed population in Colusa Co., several collections from Walker Ridge in eastern Lake Co., and a single sheet (*Stebbins 8003*, WS) from Red Mountain in Glenn Co., all of the northern populations are one-leaved.

Some herbarium labels report that the eastern Lake Co. population is mixed with regard to leaf number; however, a careful field survey indicates that this is not the case. An unusual feature of this population is the frequent withering of one leaf well before the other. As this first leaf breaks off, the plant appears to have only a single leaf, and very careful observation of the leaf base is required to detect the second.

The Colusa Co. population (*Mann s.n.* DAV, WS), on the other hand, definitely has a small percentage of one-leaved individuals. These appear to be smaller and to have smaller bulbs than the two-leaved plants and may represent young plants blooming for the first time, but they are definitely present and have not been noted in any other population.

Leaf number alone does not seem to be a reliable character for recognizing taxa in *Allium* (Mortola and McNeal loc. cit.). The occurrence of a mixed population of *Allium cratericola* with regard to the number of leaves per bulb and the lack of any other consistent characters which separate the two forms argue that they are conspecific and do not deserve recognition as separate taxa, even at the varietal level.

I thank the National Park Service for their cooperation and Steve DeBenedetti for his assistance in the field. Critical reviews by R. M. Beauchamp and T. D. Jacobsen are deeply appreciated. A list of ca. 110 herbarium specimens, examined in preparing this distribution map, is available from the author.

(Received 20 Apr 1990; revision accepted 16 Aug 1990.)

TRANSFER OF *MAHONIA TRIFOLIOLATA* VAR. *GLAUCA* TO *BERBERIS*.—JOSEPH E. LAFERRIÈRE, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721.

While I was preparing the treatment of the Berberidaceae for the upcoming Manual of the Vascular Plants of Arizona, I learned that one of the names to be included in the work had never been formally transferred from *Mahonia* to *Berberis*. Reasons for preferring the latter generic name are discussed by Moran (Phytologia 52:221–226, 1982) and Laferrière & Marroquín (Madroño 37, in press, 1990). Validation of this transfer is as follows:

Berberis trifoliolata Moric. var. *glauca* (I. M. Johnston) M. C. Johnston ex Laferrière, comb. nov.

Berberis trifoliolata Moric. var. *glauca* (I. M. Johnston) M. C. Johnston in D. S. Correll & M. C. Johnston, Vascular plants of Texas 655, 1970, nomen nudum.—*Mahonia trifoliolata* (Moric.) Fedde var. *glauca* I. M. Johnston, J. Arn. Arbor. 31:190, 1950.

Berberis trifoliata Hartweg ex Lindl., Bot. Reg. 27:misc. 68, 1841.—*Mahonia trifoliata* (Hartweg ex Lindl.) Lavallée, Arboretum Segrezianum 16, 1877.

Berberis trifoliolata var. *glauca* is known from southeastern Arizona to central Texas to Hidalgo (Ahrendt, J. Linn. Soc. Bot. 57:1–410, 1961; Marroquín, Ph.D. diss., Northeastern University, Boston, 1972). It differs from var. *trifoliolata* by its glaucous, minutely papillose epidermis. The latter is known only from southern and central Texas. M. C. Johnston (Vascular plants of Texas: a list, updating the manual of the vascular plants of Texas, 2nd ed., 1990) suggested that var. *glauca* should not

be recognized at the varietal level because of mixed populations in central Texas. He does state, however, that there is no intergradation and that outside this area of overlap the two taxa are distinct. It is for these reasons that I prefer to continue to recognize the two varieties.

The oldest name for var. *glauca* is *Berberis trifoliata*. I. M. Johnston in reducing the taxon to varietal rank chose a new epithet to avoid confusion with the specific epithet "trifoliolata." According to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, priority rules apply only within a particular rank. The two names are based on separate types but clearly represent the same taxon.

(Received 6 Jul 1990; revision accepted 12 Oct 1990.)